

NRDC

September 15, 2017

Via FOIA Online

National Freedom of Information Officer
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW (2822T)
Washington, DC 20460

Re: FOIA Request for Records Regarding EPA “Red Team-Blue Team Exercise” and
New Grant Application Review Process

Dear FOIA Officer:

I write on behalf of the Natural Resources Defense Council (“NRDC”) to request disclosure of records pursuant to the Freedom of Information Act (“FOIA”), 5 U.S.C. § 552, and applicable Environmental Protection Agency (“EPA”) regulations at 40 C.F.R. §§ 2.100-2.406.

I. Description of Records Sought

Please produce records¹ of the following types in EPA’s possession, custody, or control that:

1. Describe, outline, or relate to the “red team-blue team” exercise (“the exercise”) announced by EPA Administrator Scott Pruitt in June 2017 as a strategy to test the scientific premise of human-caused climate change and promote public debate, including:
 - a. Origin and development of the exercise;
 - b. EPA resources that have been or will be expended to develop and execute the exercise, including funds and staff allocation, and compensation for members of the red and blue teams;
 - c. Proposed timeline for the exercise including any forum, date(s), or format of proposed public debate or exchange between the red and blue teams;
 - d. Selection criteria for red and blue team members;

¹ “Records” means anything denoted by the use of that word or its singular form in the text of FOIA and includes correspondence, minutes of meetings, memoranda, notes, emails, notices, facsimiles, charts, tables, presentations, orders, filings, and other writings (handwritten, typed, electronic, or otherwise produced, reproduced, or stored). This request seeks responsive records in the custody of any EPA office, including, but not limited to, EPA Headquarters offices, and specifically including EPA offices in possession of responsive records.

NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE COUNCIL

40 W 20TH STREET | NEW YORK, NY | 10011 | T 212.727.2700 | NRDC.ORG

- e. Communications with others inside and outside the federal government regarding this exercise;
 - f. Communications with the Heartland Institute regarding this exercise, including, but not limited to, recruitment for the red team;
 - g. Names and credentials of individuals selected to be red and blue team members, as well as those offered the positions who declined; and
 - h. Records provided to or prepared for members of the red and blue teams.
2. Relate to the development and implementation of EPA's Protocol for Office of Affairs Review of Draft Competitive Grant Solicitations ("new grant review process"), released in August 2017 (attached as Exhibit A), which orders agency employees to route the final drafts of all grant solicitations for review by John Konkus, the Deputy Associate Administrator in EPA's Office of Public Affairs, including:
- a. A list of all EPA grant programs that will be subject to the new review process and for each such program:
 - i. How the new grant review process deviates from past processes used to solicit and review grant applications;
 - ii. Whether political appointees will also be signing off on the recipient of each grant after award recommendations are made by EPA career staff;
 - b. Records identifying political appointees or others who will review and/or sign off on grant decisions;
 - c. Records setting forth or relating to criteria or factors to be considered by career staff and/or political appointees in reviewing grant proposals; and
 - d. From January 20, 2017, to the date of EPA's response to this request, a list of all grants that were recommended for award by EPA career staff that were subsequently declined and a list of all grants recommended by career staff that were subsequently awarded. For each such grant, please include the name and location of the applicants, the grant program for which the application was submitted, and the reason for overruling EPA career staff's recommendations.

II. Request for a Fee Waiver

NRDC requests that EPA waive any fee it would otherwise charge for search and production of the records described above. FOIA dictates that requested records be provided without charge "if disclosure of the information is in the public interest because it is likely to contribute significantly to public understanding of the operations or activities of the government and is not primarily in the commercial interest of the requester."

5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(A)(iii); *see also* 40 C.F.R. § 2.107(l)(1). The requested disclosure would meet both of these requirements. In addition, NRDC qualifies as "a representative of the news media" entitled to a reduction of fees under FOIA. 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(A)(ii)(II); *see also* 40 C.F.R. § 2.107(c)(1)(iii).

A. NRDC Satisfies the First Fee Waiver Requirement

The disclosure requested here would be “likely to contribute significantly to public understanding of the operations or activities of the government.” 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(A)(iii); 40 C.F.R. § 2.107(l)(1). Each of the four factors used by EPA to evaluate the first fee waiver requirement indicates that a fee waiver is appropriate for this request. *See* 40 C.F.R. § 2.107(l)(2).

1. Subject of the request

The records requested here involve policies, programs, and priorities adopted and implemented by EPA under Administrator Pruitt regarding climate change including critique of established science and defunding or denying grants for the further development of climate science. The requested records thus directly concern “the operations or activities of the government.” 40 C.F.R. § 2.107(l)(2)(i).

2. Informative value of the information to be disclosed

The requested records are “likely to contribute to” the public’s understanding of government operations and activities, 40 C.F.R. § 2.107(l)(2)(ii). The public does not currently possess comprehensive information regarding the Trump Administration’s response to climate change. There is more than a reasonable likelihood that these records have informative value to the public because they would inform the public on two separate initiatives underway at EPA that influence the development of climate science and policy discussions on how and whether to confront the effects of climate change. *See Citizens for Responsibility & Ethics in Washington v. U.S. Dep’t of Health & Human Servs.*, 481 F. Supp. 2d 99, 109 (D.D.C. 2006).

We believe that the records requested are not currently in the public domain. Their disclosure would thus meaningfully inform public understanding with respect to EPA’s attitude and actions relating to climate science, as further discussed below. However, if EPA were to conclude that some of the requested records are publicly available, NRDC would like to discuss that conclusion and might agree to exclude such records from this request.

3. Contribution to an understanding of the subject by the public is likely to result from disclosure.

Because NRDC is a “representative of the news media,” as explained in Part II.C below, EPA must presume that this disclosure is likely to contribute to public understanding of its subject. 40 C.F.R. § 2.107(l)(2)(iii).

However, even if NRDC were not a media requester, NRDC's expertise in climate change policy and science, extensive communications capabilities, and proven history of dissemination of information of public interest—including information obtained from FOIA records requests—indicate that NRDC has the ability and will to use disclosed records to reach a broad audience of interested persons with any relevant and newsworthy information the records reveal. There is a strong likelihood that disclosure of the requested records will increase public understanding of the subject matter. *See Judicial Watch, Inc. v. Rossotti*, 326 F.3d 1309, 1314 (D.C. Cir. 2003) (finding that a requester that specified multiple channels of dissemination and estimated viewership numbers demonstrated a likelihood of contributing to public understanding of government operations and activities).

NRDC intends to disseminate any newsworthy information in the released records and its analysis of such records to its member base and to the broader public, through one or more of the many communications channels referenced below. NRDC has frequently disseminated newsworthy information to the public for free, and does not intend to resell the information requested here. NRDC's more than two million members and online activists are "a broad audience of persons interested in the subject" of climate change and climate science, 40 C.F.R. § 2.107(l)(2)(iii), and when combined with NRDC's communications to the public at large, the likely audience of interested persons to be reached is certainly "reasonably broad." 40 C.F.R. § 2.107(l)(2)(iii). As NRDC's long history of incorporating information obtained through FOIA into reports, articles, and other communications illustrates, NRDC is well prepared to convey to the public any relevant information it obtains through this records request.

NRDC has the ability to disseminate information collected from this FOIA request through many channels. These include, but are not limited to, the following:

- NRDC's website, available at <http://www.nrdc.org> (homepage at Att. 1), is updated daily and draws approximately 1.3 million page views and 510,000 unique visitors per month. The new NRDC.org launched in late March 2016 and features NRDC staff blogs, original reporting of environmental news stories, and more.
- NRDC's Activist email list includes more than 2.1 million members and online activists who receive regular communications on urgent environmental issues. (sample email at Att. 2) This information is also made available through NRDC's online Action Center at <https://www.nrdc.org/actions> (Att. 3).
- NRDC *This Week* is a weekly electronic environmental newsletter distributed by email to more than 86,700 subscribers, at <http://www.nrdc.org/newsletter> (Att. 4).
- NRDC updates and maintains several social media accounts: Facebook (565,530 followers) (Att. 5), Twitter (195,426 followers) (Att. 6), Instagram (37,868 followers) (Att. 7), YouTube (19,518 subscribers) (Att. 8), and LinkedIn (9,108 followers) (Att. 9).

9). We also use Medium as another distribution channel for our content (1,478 followers).

NRDC issues press releases, issue papers, and reports; directs and produces movies, such as *Sonic Sea*, *Stories from the Gulf*, and *Acid Test*, narrated by Rachel McAdams, Robert Redford, and Sigourney Weaver, respectively; participates in press conferences and interviews with reporters and editorial writers; distributes content on Huffington Post (Att. 10); and has more than fifty staff members dedicated to communications work.

NRDC employees provide Congressional testimony; appear on television, radio, and web broadcasts and at conferences; and contribute to numerous national newspapers, magazines, academic journals, other periodicals, and books. A few examples are provided below:

- Research article, “The requirement to rebuild US fish stocks: Is it working?” *Marine Policy*, July 2014 (co-authored by NRDC Oceans Program Senior Scientist Lisa Suatoni and Senior Attorney Brad Sewell) (Att. 11);
- Issue brief, “The Untapped Potential of California’s Water Supply: Efficiency, Reuse, and Stormwater,” June 2014 (co-authored by NRDC Water Program Senior Attorney Kate Poole and Senior Policy Analyst Ed Osann) (Att. 12); *see also* “Saving Water in California,” *N.Y. Times*, July 9, 2014 (discussing the report’s estimates) (Att. 13);
- Article, “Waves of phony charges over new clean water safeguards,” *The Hill*, June 17, 2014 (by former NRDC Executive Director Peter Lehner) (Att. 14);
- Article, “Don’t Buy the Smear of the EPA,” *L.A. Times*, June 3, 2014 (by former NRDC President Frances Beinecke) (Att. 15);
- Transcript, “Conservationists Call For Quiet: The Ocean Is Too Loud!” Nat’l Pub. Radio, *All Things Considered*, July 28, 2013 (featuring NRDC Marine Mammal Protection Program Director Michael Jasny) (Att. 16);
- Testimony of David Doniger, NRDC Climate and Air Program Policy Director and Senior Attorney, before the United States House Subcommittee on Energy and Power, June 19, 2012 (Att. 17);
- Article, “Pollution Still a Hazard to U.S. Beaches,” CBS, *CBS NEWS*, July 29, 2009 (featuring former NRDC Water Program Co-Director Nancy Stoner) (Att. 18);
- Conference brochure, “World Business Summit on Climate Change,” May 24-26, 2009 (featuring former NRDC Director for Market Innovation Rick Duke at 9) (Att. 19);
- Article, “Is there a ‘proper level’ of compliance with environmental law?” *Trends: ABA Section of Environment, Energy, and Resources Newsletter*, Jan./Feb. 2008 (authored by NRDC Litigation Co-Director Michael Wall) (Att. 20);
- NRDC Document Bank, <http://docs.nrdc.org/> (Att. 21).

NRDC routinely uses FOIA to obtain information from federal agencies that NRDC legal and scientific experts analyze in order to inform the public about a variety of issues, including energy policy, climate change, wildlife protection, nuclear weapons, pesticides, drinking water safety, and air quality. Some specific examples are provided below:

- In April 2014, NRDC relied on FOIA documents for a report on potentially unsafe chemicals added to food, without the safety oversight of the Food and Drug Administration or the notification of the public. The report, titled *Generally Recognized as Secret: Chemicals Added to Food in the United States*, reveals concerns within the agency about several chemicals used as ingredients in food that manufacturers claim are “generally recognized as safe” (Att. 22). *See also* Kimberly Kindy, “Are secret, dangerous ingredients in your food?” *Wash. Post*, Apr. 7, 2014 (discussing NRDC’s report) (Att. 23).
- NRDC obtained, through FOIA, FDA review documents on the nontherapeutic use of antibiotic additives in livestock and poultry feed. In January 2014, NRDC published a report, titled *Playing Chicken with Antibiotics*, which is based on the documents obtained, and reveals decades of hesitancy on FDA’s part to ensure the safety of these drug additives (Att. 24). *See also* P.J. Huffstutter and Brian Grow, “Drug critic slams FDA over antibiotic oversight in meat production,” *Reuters*, Jan. 27, 2014 (discussing NRDC’s report) (Att. 25).
- NRDC has used White House documents obtained through FOIA and from other sources to inform the public about EPA’s decision not to protect wildlife and workers from the pesticide atrazine in the face of industry pressure to keep atrazine on the market. *See Still Poisoning the Well: Atrazine Continues to Contaminate Surface Water and Drinking Water in the United States*, <http://www.nrdc.org/health/atrazine/files/atrazine10.pdf> (Apr. 2010) (update to 2009 report) (Att. 26); *see also* William Souder, “It’s Not Easy Being Green: Are Weed-Killers Turning Frogs Into Hermaphrodites?” *Harper’s Bazaar*, Aug. 1, 2006 (referencing documents obtained and posted online by NRDC) (Att. 27).
- NRDC incorporated information obtained through FOIA into a report, available at <http://www.nrdc.org/wildlife/marine/sound/contents.asp>, on the impacts of military sonar and other industrial noise pollution on marine life. *See Sounding the Depths II: The Rising Toll of Sonar, Shipping and Industrial Ocean Noise on Marine Life* (Nov. 2005) (update to 1999 report) (Att. 28). The report also relied upon and synthesized information from other sources. Since the report’s publication, the

sonar issue has continued to attract widespread public attention. *See, e.g.,* “Protest Raised over New Tests of Naval Sonar,” Nat’l Pub. Radio, *All Things Considered*, July 24, 2007 (transcript at Att. 29).

- NRDC scientists have used information obtained through FOIA to publish analyses of the United States’ and other nations’ nuclear weapons programs. In 2004, for example, NRDC scientists incorporated information obtained through FOIA into a feature article on the United States’ plans to deploy a ballistic missile system and the implications for global security. *See* Hans M. Kristensen, Matthew G. McKinzie, and Robert S. Norris, “The Protection Paradox,” *Bulletin of Atomic Scientists*, Mar./Apr. 2004 (Att. 30).
- NRDC obtained through FOIA, and made public, records of the operations of the Bush administration’s Energy Task Force, along with analysis of selected excerpts and links to the administration’s index of withheld documents (Att. 31). NRDC’s efforts cast light on an issue of considerable public interest. *See, e.g.,* Elizabeth Shogren, “Bush Gets One-Two Punch on Energy,” *L.A. Times*, Mar. 28, 2002, at A22 (Att. 32).
- Through FOIA, NRDC obtained a memorandum by ExxonMobil, advocating the replacement of the sitting head of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, and used the document to help inform the public about what may have been behind the Bush administration’s decision to replace Dr. Robert Watson. *See* NRDC Press Release and attached Exxon memorandum, “Confidential Papers Show Exxon Hand in White House Move to Oust Top Scientist from International Global Warming Panel,” Apr. 3, 2002 (Att. 33); Elizabeth Shogren, “Charges Fly Over Science Panel Pick,” *L.A. Times*, Apr. 4, 2002, at A19 (Att. 34).
- Through FOIA and other sources, NRDC obtained information on nationwide levels of arsenic in drinking water and used it in a report, *Arsenic and Old Laws* (2000) (Att. 35). The report guided interested members of the public on how to learn more about arsenic in their own drinking water supplies. *Id.*; *see also* Steve LaRue, “EPA Aims to Cut Levels of Arsenic in Well Water,” *San Diego Union-Tribune*, June 5, 2000, at B1 (referencing NRDC report) (Att. 36).²

² There are numerous other examples of national news articles that were based in part on documents NRDC obtained through FOIA. *See, e.g.,* Felicity Barringer, “Science Panel Issues Report on Exposure to Pollutant,” *N.Y. Times*, Jan. 11, 2005 (Att. 37); Katharine Q. Seelye, “Draft of Air Rule is Said to Exempt Many Old Plants,” *N.Y. Times*, Aug. 22, 2003 (Att. 38); Do n Van Natta,

As these examples demonstrate, NRDC has a proven ability to digest, synthesize, and quickly disseminate information gleaned from FOIA requests to a broad audience of interested persons. Therefore, the requested records disclosure is likely to contribute to the public's understanding of the subject.

4. Significance of the contribution to public understanding

The records requested shed light on a matter of considerable public interest and concern: policies, programs, and attitudes of the Trump Administration with respect to climate change and the politicization of climate science. *See, e.g.* Emily Holden, "Pruitt: EPA will review 'politicized' climate science report," *Politico*, Aug. 11, 2017 ("Pruitt said his staff will gauge the 'accuracy' of a major federal science report that blames human activity for climate change.") (Exhibit B); Zack Coleman, "Trump has no science adviser. Will that politicize climate?" *E&E News*, Aug. 11, 2017 ("The difference between the Bush presidency and the current one is that there's no one to check political instincts with science.") (Exhibit C).

Since Administrator Pruitt first announced his intent to implement a "red team-blue team" exercise to spur public debate on climate science, there has been significant public interest in the exercise. *See, e.g.* E. Calvin Beisner, "Taking politics out of climate science: A red team, blue team match would test the assumptions of man-made global warming," *Washington Times*, Aug. 29, 2017 (arguing that the exercise "would lead to better quality in government-funded climate (and other environmental) science.") (Exhibit D). There has also been significant public concern over and critique of the exercise. *See, e.g.* David Roberts, "Scott Pruitt's terrible plan to 'objectively' assess climate science," *Vox*, Aug. 2, 2017 (critiquing the exercise as unsuited to basic science) (Exhibit E); John Siciliano, "Trump administration lining up climate change 'red team,'" *Washington Examiner*, Jul. 24, 2017 (arguing that the exercise will unduly give equal weight to red and blue teams) (Exhibit F); Brad Plumer and Coral Davenport, "E.P.A. to Give Dissenters a Voice on Climate, No Matter the Consensus," *N.Y. Times*, Jun. 30, 2017 (Exhibit G).

In addition to the exercise, there is significant public concern regarding EPA's new grant review process requiring political appointees to review grant requests. *See, e.g.* Sean Reilly, "Pruitt assigns political appointee to vet grant requests," *E&E News*, Aug. 17, 2017 (attaching unsigned directive and observing that "[i]n a sharp break with tradition, U.S. EPA Administrator Scott Pruitt has inserted a senior political appointee into the role of vetting competitive grant solicitations collectively worth hundreds of millions of dollars each year.")

Jr., "E-Mail Suggests Energy Official Encouraged Lobbyist on Policy," *N.Y. Times*, Apr. 27, 2002 (Att. 39).

(Exhibit H). Specifically, there is concern that the political review is targeted at denying climate-related requests. See Rebecca Savransky, “EPA puts Trump political aide in charge of grant funding decisions,” *The Hill*, Sept. 5, 2017 (reporting that in his new role, John Konkus “has told grant officers that references to climate change should be taken out.”) (Exhibit I). There is also congressional concern regarding the new grant review process. See Letter from Sen. Tom Carper to Scott Pruitt, EPA Administrator (Aug. 24, 2017) (Exhibit J).

Public understanding of EPA’s attitude and actions relating to climate science would be significantly enhanced by disclosure of the requested records concerning the red team-blue team exercise and the new grant review process. Disclosure would help the public to more effectively evaluate the Trump administration’s role in developing, critiquing, or censoring climate science. Disclosure would also help the public to better understand and evaluate EPA’s actions (or inaction) on the threats posed by climate change.

B. NRDC Satisfies the Second Fee Waiver Requirement

Disclosure in this case would also satisfy the second prerequisite of a fee waiver request because NRDC does not have any commercial interest that would be furthered by the requested disclosure. 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(A)(iii); 40 C.F.R. § 2.107(l)(1), (3). NRDC is a not-for-profit organization and does not act as a middleman to resell information obtained under FOIA. “Congress amended FOIA to ensure that it be ‘liberally construed in favor of waivers for noncommercial requesters.’” *Rossotti*, 326 F.3d at 1312 (internal citation omitted); see *Natural Res. Def. Council v. United States Env’tl. Prot. Agency*, 581 F. Supp. 2d 491, 498 (S.D.N.Y. 2008). NRDC wishes to serve the public by reviewing, analyzing, and disclosing newsworthy and presently non-public information about of EPA’s development and critique of climate science. As noted at Part II.A, any work done by EPA to advance or critique climate science relates to a matter of considerable public interest and concern. Disclosure of the requested records will contribute significantly to public understanding of the Trump Administration’s response to climate change and associated threats to human health and the environment.

C. NRDC Is a Media Requester

Even if EPA denies a public interest waiver of all costs and fees, NRDC is a representative of the news media entitled to a reduction of fees under FOIA, 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(A)(ii), and EPA’s FOIA regulations, 40 C.F.R. § 2.107(c)(1)(iii); see also 40 C.F.R. § 2.107(b)(6) (defining “[r]epresentative of the news media”). A representative of the news media is “any person or entity that gathers information of potential interest to a segment of the public, uses its editorial skills to turn the raw materials into a distinct work, and distributes that work to an audience.” 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(A)(ii); see also *Elec. Privacy Info. Ctr. v. Dep’t of Def.*, 241 F. Supp. 2d 5, 6, 11-15 (D.D.C. 2003) (a “non-profit public interest organization” qualifies as a

representative of the news media under FOIA where it publishes books and newsletters on issues of current interest to the public); Letter from Alexander C. Morris, FOIA Officer, United States Dep't of Energy, to Joshua Berman, NRDC (Feb. 10, 2011) (Att. 40) (granting NRDC media requester status).

NRDC is in part organized and operated to gather and publish or transmit news to the public. As described earlier in this request, NRDC publishes original reporting of environmental news stories on its website, <http://www.nrdc.org>. Previously, NRDC published stories like these in its magazine, *OnEarth*, which has won numerous news media awards, including the Independent Press Award for Best Environmental Coverage and for General Excellence, a Gold Eddie Award for editorial excellence among magazines, and the Phillip D. Reed Memorial Award for Outstanding Writing on the Southern Environment. NRDC also publishes a regular newsletter for its more than two million members and online activists; issues other electronic newsletters, action alerts, public reports and analyses; and maintains free online libraries of these publications. See 40 C.F.R. § 2.107(b)(6) (“Examples of news media include . . . publishers of periodicals.”). NRDC maintains a significant additional communications presence on the internet through its staff blogs on <http://www.nrdc.org>, which are updated regularly and feature writing about current environmental issues, through daily news messaging on “Twitter” and “Facebook,” and through content distributed to outlets such as Medium. See OPEN Government Act of 2007, Pub. L. No. 110-175, § 3, 121 Stat. 2524 (2007) (codified at 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(A)(ii)) (clarifying that “as methods of news delivery evolve . . . such alternative media shall be considered to be news-media entities”). The aforementioned publications and media sources routinely include information about current events of interest to the readership and the public. To publish and transmit this news content, NRDC employs more than fifty staff members dedicated full-time to communications with the public, including accomplished journalists and editors. These staff members rely on information acquired under FOIA and through other means. Public interest organizations meeting the requirements “are regularly granted news representative status.” *Serv. Women’s Action Network v. Dep’t of Def.*, 888 F. Supp. 2d 282, 287-88 (D. Conn. 2012) (according media requester status to the American Civil Liberties Union).

Information obtained as a result of this request will, if appropriately newsworthy, be synthesized with information from other sources and used by NRDC to create and disseminate unique articles, reports, analyses, blogs, tweets, emails, and/or other distinct informational works through one or more of NRDC’s publications or other suitable media channels. NRDC staff gather information from a variety of sources—including documents provided pursuant to FOIA requests—to write original articles and reports that are featured on its website, in its newsletters and blogs, and on other media outlets. See *Cause of Action v. Fed. Trade Comm’n*, 961 F. Supp. 2d 142, 163 (D.D.C. 2013) (explaining that an organization can qualify for media-requester status if it “distributes work to an audience and is especially organized around doing so”).

NRDC seeks the requested records to aid its own news-disseminating activities by obtaining, analyzing, and distributing information likely to contribute significantly to public understanding, not to resell the information to other media organizations.

III. Willingness to Pay Fees Under Protest

Please provide the records requested above regardless of your fee waiver decision. In order to expedite a response, NRDC will, if necessary and under protest, pay fees in accordance with EPA's FOIA regulations at 40 C.F.R. § 2.107(c)(1)(iv) for all or a portion of the requested records. *See* 40 C.F.R. § 2.107(l)(4). Please contact me before doing anything that would cause the fee to exceed \$250. NRDC reserves its rights to seek administrative or judicial review of any fee waiver denial.

IV. Conclusion

Please email or (if it is not possible to email) mail the requested records to me at the NRDC office address listed below. Please send them on a rolling basis; EPA search for—or deliberations concerning—certain records should not delay the production of others that EPA has already retrieved and elected to produce. *See generally* 40 C.F.R. § 2.104 (describing response deadlines). If EPA concludes that any of the records requested here are publicly available, please let me know.

Please do not hesitate to call or email with questions.

Thank you.

Sincerely,



Joya Sonnenfeldt*

Litigation Fellow

Natural Resources Defense Council

40 West 20th Street, 11th Floor

New York, NY 10011

(212) 727-4602

jsonnenfeldt@nrdc.org

*J.D./M.E.M. not yet admitted to the bar

Enclosures (sent via FOIA Online):
Attachments 1 through 40 (single .pdf file)
Exhibits A through J (single .pdf file)